

## Testimony for cell phones HB 5867

Good morning Chairmen Doyle and Taborsak, I am Rep. Urban 43<sup>rd</sup> district and I am here to testify on HB 5867 An Act Requiring Labeling of Cell Phones and SB 463 An Act Concerning the Labeling of cell phones

Different models of cell phones can give off different levels of Radio Frequency (RF) waves. One way to get information on the Selective Absorption Rate (SAR) for a specific phone model is to find the FCC identification number for that model. The FCC ID number is usually somewhere on the phone sometimes under the battery pack. Once you have the ID number you can go to the WED address: [www.fcc.gov/oet/ea/fccid](http://www.fcc.gov/oet/ea/fccid). On this page you can find instructions for entering the FCC ID number; although in doing this myself it is not an easy site to navigate. The SAR's run from a low number of .4 to a high number of 2.

Markets work the best when consumers have as much information as possible. As a matter of fact, the model for a perfectly competitive market rests on access to complete information. Information allows the consumer to make informed choices driving the market to be more responsive and more competitive. The more information available, the better the market works for the consumer. As the information about SAR for cell phones is already available, making it accessible would allow consumers to make informed decisions about how much RF waves/electromagnetic radiation they would chose to be exposed to and what level they feel is appropriate for their children. By posting the SAR next to phone models in stores (which San Francisco has done but is presently being sued) the information would be totally accessible for the consumer. I would suggest that labeling at the retail level (HB 5867) combined with consumer education about safe use (SB 463) would be a very effective way to assure that consumers are well informed.

There is significant concern that long term cell phone use might increase the risk of tumors, particularly because studies have not been able to follow people for very long periods of time. When tumors form after a known cancer-causing exposure it usually takes decades for them to develop (latency). Because cell phones have been in widespread use for less than 20 years it is not possible to rule out future health effects.

In addition, studies done so far have focused on adults not children. I am reminded of the research done on chemicals that originally focused on adults until it became obvious that the impact on a child's growing body exacerbated the impacts and studies were expanded to include children. There are similar concerns about cell phone usage on a child's growing brain. A series of studies by electrical engineer Dr. Om P. Gandhi indicates that electromagnetic fields from cell phones are absorbed more deeply into the brains of children than adults

The American Cancer Society acknowledges that there is much information missing on this issue and it is appropriate to take precautions until that information is provided. In Israel, France and Finland and the European Union, governments are officially warning citizens about the safer use of cell phones even

while research is still underway. Similar advisories exist in England, India, China and Russia. The University of Pittsburgh Cancer Institute (UPCI) joined with these countries in advising that children not regularly use cell phones. In addition, Dr. Herberman, Director of UPCI issued a list of simple precautions to take when using a cell phone. Go to [www.environmentaloncology.org](http://www.environmentaloncology.org) for the complete list.

The State of Maine recently addressed this issue with a bill requiring labeling of cell phones indicating that cell phones release electromagnetic radiation and should not be used next to the head or body. The bill did not pass but I have the testimony that was presented and it is extensive. Suffice it to say that there is real concern in the scientific community about the use of cell phones.

I would also point out that Public Health Warnings are historically the province of states. States have issued requirements regarding bicycle helmets, seat belts, nutritional labeling and prescription drug labeling. Recently the US Supreme Court in 2009 upheld a Vermont State requirement for a warning label on a drug rejecting the argument that the federal FDA exemption pre-empted the state from acting. Personally, I always look for the label on milk products indicating that Growth Hormones have not been used. Think about the reasons for delays in controlling tobacco, they clearly had much to do with politics and not with science.

It would be a prudent step for the State of Connecticut to require that cell phones are clearly labeled or that retail stores post the SAR level and that consumers have access to education about the safe use of cell phones.